

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARIE ENCAR ARNOLD,
Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, *et*
al.
Defendants.

Case No. 1:23-cv-00266-ADA-CDB

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S SECOND
MOTION FOR ELECTRONIC FILING

(Doc. 10)

Plaintiff Marie Encar Arnold (“Plaintiff”) is proceeding *pro se* in this action filed on February 22, 2023. (Doc. 1). Plaintiff has paid the filing fee and this matter is set for a scheduling conference on May 18, 2023; however, no Defendant has yet appeared. (Doc. 3). On March 31, 2023, Plaintiff filed a motion for electronic filing. (Doc. 7). On April 5, 2023, the Court issued an order denying Plaintiff’s motion as it contained no explanation or justification for access to the electronic filing system. (Doc. 9).

Before the Court is Plaintiff’s second motion for electronic filing. (Doc. 10). Under the Court’s Local Rules, *pro se* parties are required to “file and serve paper documents” and “may not utilize electronic filing except with the permission of the assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge.” Local Rule 133(b)(2) (emphasis omitted). Any request for an exception to this rule must be submitted as a stipulation between the parties or a “written motion setting out an explanation of reasons for the exception.” Local Rule 133(b)(3).

1 It is within the Court's discretion to grant or deny such a request. *Reddy v. Precyse*
2 *Solutions LLC*, No. 1:12-cv-02061-AWI-SAB, 2013 WL 2603413, at *3 (E.D. Cal. June 11,
3 2013). Here, Plaintiff asserts she is capable of following the requirements for e-filing and has
4 "regular access to technical requirement necessary to e-file successfully." (Doc. 10 at 2). The
5 Court finds that Plaintiff has not shown good cause to warrant an exception to the Local Rule.

6 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, Plaintiff's motion for electronic filing (Doc.
7 10) is DENIED.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: **April 12, 2023**


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE